

11 3

D

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CUTTACK BENCH

ORIGINAL APPLICATION No. 78 OF 1987.

Date of decision .. December 17, 1987.

Subrat Mishra, aged 24 years,
son of Nrusingha Charan Misra,
At- Goudasahi, P.S.Binjharapur,
Dist- Cuttack .. Applicant.

Versus

1. Union of India, through the
Secretary to Government of India,
Ministry of Water Resources,
New Delhi.
2. Central Ground Water Board,
having its Head Office at
Faridabad, New Delhi.
3. Union Public Service Commission,
through the Secretary,
Dholpur House, Shahajahan Road,
New Delhi . .. Respondents.

M/s Pradeep Mohanty, B.P. Ray,
Sanjiv Das & Sangram Das,
Advocates. .. For Applicant.

Mr. A.B. Misra, Sr. Standing Counsel
(Central) .. For Respondents.

C O R A M :

THE HON'BLE MR. B.R. PATEL, VICE CHAIRMAN

A N D

THE HON'BLE MR. K.P. ACHARYA, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

1. Whether the reporters of local papers may be
allowed to see the judgment ? Yes .
 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ? No .
 3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair
copy of the judgment ? Yes .
-

J U D G M E N T

K.P.ACHARYA, MEMBER (JUDICIAL), In this application under section 19 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985, the petitioner prays to direct the respondents- Opposite Parties to issue a letter of appointment to the petitioner pursuant to the recommendation of the Union Public Service Commission .

2. Shortly stated , the case of the petitioner is that he was an applicant to the post of Assistant Hydrogeologist for which advertisement was published and applications were invited. The applicant appeared before the Union Public Service Commission and it was maintained in the application that even though Union Public Service Commission had recommended the case of the applicant, yet the competent authority has not issued the order of appointment and therefore the above prayer was made .

3. In their counter , the respondents maintained that the matter is under consideration and steps should be taken as soon as possible.

4. We have heard Mr. Sanjiv Das, learned counsel appearing for the applicant and Mr. A.B.Misra, learned Sr. Standing Counsel (Central) for the respondents at some length. From the arguments advanced at the Bar, we find that initially the order of appointment was not issued in favour of the applicant because he was found to be medically unfit but subsequently in view of the fitness of the applicant, the competent authority has issued the order of appointment in favour of the applicant. In such circumstances,

we feel that there is no further scope on our part warranting an interference.

5. Thus, the application is accordingly disposed of leaving the parties to bear their own costs .

[Signature]
17.12.87

.....
Member (Judicial)

B.R. PATEL, VICE CHAIRMAN,

9 agree.



[Signature]
17.12.87

.....
Vice Chairman.

Central Administrative Tribunal,
Cuttack Bench.
December 17, 1987/Roy SPA.